The
COMMONWEAL

VOLUME XLIII *November 9, 1945* NUMBER 4

THE WEEK 83
LEOPOLD AND THE BELGIANS *B. Hollants* 86
TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT *Sidney Aberman* 90
THE PLACE OF SPLENDOR (*Verse*) *Jessica Powers* 92
COMMUNICATIONS 93
THE SCREEN *Philip T. Hartung* 94
THE MORGENTHAU PLAN *George Doherty* 95
ARMS AND THE MAN *Richard J. Purcell* 97
MORE BOOKS OF THE WEEK 98
Benjamin Franklin's Autobiographical Writings — Kitchen Fugue — Cass Timberlane — Conrad Weiser — The Human Life of Jesus

THE COMMONWEAL *is indexed in the Reader's Guide, Catholic Periodical Index and Catholic Bookman. Founded by the Calvert Associates, Inc., in 1924, with Michael Williams as President and Editor.*

Published weekly and copyrighted 1945 in the U.S.A. by THE COMMONWEAL *Publishing Co., Inc.*, 386 *Fourth Avenue*, New York 16, N. Y. AShland 4-9685. Entered as second class matter February 9, 1934 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. U.S. $5 a year. Canada and Foreign $6. Single copies 10c.

Editors: EDWARD SKILLIN, JR.

PHILIP BURNHAM (*now on duty with the armed forces*)
HARRY LORIN BINSSE, *Managing Editor*; C. G. PAULDING, *Literary Editor*; JOHN C. CORT, *Associate Editor*; JOHN BRUBAKER, *Advertising Manager*.

Approach to Winter

IT IS November. And then it will be December. The way Tuesday follows upon Monday. Swiftly. The autumn foliage is so beautiful, and then the trees are bare. In America we can appreciate the seasons. If winter comes, then spring . . . we say—but both are beautiful.

They are not without charm in Europe. Breughel loved the winter, Corot the spring; they were just like Americans: they admired the seasons; they looked at people skating, they looked at the hunters, hunting the boar, returning to the village through the snow for whatever celebration there was that was like Thanksgiving Day or at Christmas time with the smoke coming out of all the chimneys; they looked at the young green of the trees with the gentle air moving the leaves. Those paintings are in the museums; those painters in their tombs. No one in Europe now admires the winter; many cannot hope to see the spring.

There has been the war. There have been, however, people who have survived the war. There are all the Europeans who have died in the war — soldiers in various uniforms and men, women and children who were not in uniform when they were bombed to death or driven from their homes to die. But there are men, women and children who are still alive, who managed to get through the war (some of the children have been born—perhaps not too easily, perhaps not at $500 apiece in the hospital—even after the war). These are the people who now are entering the winter. November; December—and that is not the end of it either. They are entering the winter most unhappily because of the war but not entirely because of the war. The German people, in particular, are entering the winter most unhappily because they lost the war, but not entirely because they lost the war. The friends of those who won the war, the liberated peoples, are unhappy too, so that it is not just a question of having lost the war.

It is a question of broken promises. The broken promise of the Atlantic Charter and, immediately, the broken promise of UNRRA.

We are entering a winter during which we can build all the Fords we shall drive in the spring. Pleasantly we are advancing toward a Thanksgiving Day for pointless butter, a Christmas Day on which the trees sold on the streets will be decorated with candles and will not be burned to keep us from the cold. Charmingly, already, our ladies wear their furs. Is this a season to talk about broken promises when it is a season of such promised delights?

What is happening to America? Will this victory we have won be ruined by ourselves, this peace we promised, denied, this justice we offered, refused? Dorothy Thompson speaks with a greater eloquence than she has ever had before; Samuel Grafton with more controlled reason and wit than ever before; and Americans who do not write pieces that are syndicated, who talk only to their friends and neighbors, hear about what is happening to the peoples of Europe and they speak also. They would like to help these people who despairingly are entering the winter; they do not like to think about the displaced persons, the displaced millions, and they do not care whether these wandering millions are Germans or not.

But these Americans, these many Americans who have not closed their hearts to charity, who have not forgotten what America promised, who want that promise kept, are not in Congress and do not speak in Congress. They are not heard in Congress. They hear nothing from Congress. Nothing of any interest. Nothing to the point. By its dilatory action, its obstructionism, Congress is sending the peoples of Europe into their winter of despair.

Why is there no one in Congress to speak like this: "If, as is now thought, millions during this winter freeze and starve, this will not have been the inevitable consequence of material destruction and world shortages of material"? Or like this: "We are protesting against the wanton and deliberate creation of a new sore when all Europe is crying out from her wounds. We should consider whether it is not possible to make a new call to our Allies, and if we find they will not act with us we should do our best to act alone. It is still

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our duty to show that this country is the foremost champion of tolerance and decency."

These words were not spoken in Congress. They were spoken by the representatives of a democracy which had suffered hunger and privation and bombing. They were spoken by Sir Arthur Salter and by Michael Foot in the British House of Commons. They refer directly to the present treatment of that German nation which was responsible for British suffering. When they had been spoken Mr. Bevin, Foreign Minister, rising, said: "I wish there were similar Parliaments to this and free and unfettered discussion of this problem in other countries of Europe." It was kind of him not to have added "and in America."

Security and Subject Peoples

THE MOST voluminous evidence of disease, destitution and political terror in "unoccupied" Poland comes in a long series of dispatches from Warsaw to the New York *Times* by Gladwin Hill. The presence of hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers in a supposedly independent country, the stripping of the land of livestock and machinery, the Moscow-dominated Government's concentration camps, the liquidation of opposition leaders and the feeling of terror which inspire the inhabitants add up to a tragic story. Some of the churches are open, some Catholic papers have started up with strictly limited editions, according to the Religious News Service, but anti-Catholic propaganda is widespread. What has happened to Poland beyond the fearful ravages resulting directly from the war is repeated to a lesser degree and in varying fashion in the other European countries immediately in the Russian zone. The most heart-rending reports have also filtered out from Russian-held Korea.

The evidence is too conclusive to deny. Therefore Soviet apologists have defended this policy in a different fashion. They say that the United States enjoys immediate security since it has not allowed any other Power to seize control in any of the other Americas. Russia, too, must have a comparable security zone. Moreover, the United States is running things as she likes in Japan; why, then, should anyone kick about Soviet unilateral action? Historical and geographic accidents may have something to do with it, but the achievement of an American security zone—if there is such a thing in an atomic age—does not in fact involve wholesale despoilment, liquidation, terrorization and domination. Making every allowance for the geographical contiguity, national antagonisms and subject peoples with which the Soviet régime has to deal, Americans cannot countenance the means resorted to. Whatever the extenuating circumstances and whatever may be our own shortcomings in the field of foreign policy, we are flatly opposed to the methods employed by the Soviets in Central and Eastern Europe, if not in the Far East, as well.

What should be the upshot of this opposition? For surely we do not wish these inhuman conditions to continue. On the one hand there is war, on the other Russo-American cooperation. The first is inconceivable; it would destroy all hope for everyone including the persecuted subject populations. The second is the only possible solution. But how are we to attain it? Perhaps the biggest single obstacle is Russia's continued feeling of insecurity. It is all very well to make light of such a sentiment. But consider our own case. What are our insistence on the retention of certain Pacific island bases and our patent anxiety over what to do with our atomic bomb but manifestations of an identical feeling? This country is not adjacent to potentially hostile and powerful neighbors as Russia is, either. Nor have our lands been over-run by invading armies twice within the past twenty-five years. There is something understandable about Russian fears.

To recognize that is a starting point. Then to act upon it. A farsighted atomic bomb policy—an international set-up which would prevent atomic bomb manufacture anywhere—would come first. This indeed may be only a part of the establishment of an effective world organization. Then a certain number of conciliatory gestures such as a real share for Russia in the control of Japan, economic aid for the purpose of her civilian rehabilitation, less self-righteousness and more downright friendliness toward Russia in our public utterances. A general program of this kind would go far toward drawing Russia into a policy of wholehearted international collaboration. And all the while we should make it perfectly plain to Joseph Stalin and his successors that what is going on in Russian-dominated borderlands is flagrantly opposed to our most cherished traditions. It is not plain speaking which we must fear where Russia is concerned; it is, rather, high-flung generalities coupled with a policy which fosters the easily-aroused suspicion so characteristic of Stalin and his colleagues. In Russo-American collaboration resides the only hope.

For the Three-Power Bomb Conference

A FEW DAYS after this issue of THE COMMONWEAL reaches its readers, Messrs. Attlee, Mackenzie King and Truman are scheduled to confer together in Washington with regard to the problems springing from our invention and use of the atomic bomb. Presumably these three gentlemen will seek to devise ways whereby this horrible new power for destruction can be curbed—and curbed by political means, since everyone qualified to speak insists that there are no other means available to us. It is a terrible responsibility. And it is shared by the various members of Congress

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who are likewise devoting their attention to the problem.

It may seem obvious, but it is worth stating clearly and unequivocally that if it were not for the existence of Soviet Russia as a great and allied power, the question of the bomb would be vastly simpler. Unhappily there exists today an even greater psychological barrier of suspicion and distrust between Russia and the Western Allies than ever before. Russia's activities in eastern and central Europe as well as her general truculence have had a profound effect upon public opinion in the west. They unquestionably played a part in the French elections, in which the communists might legitimately have expected to come out even better than they did. For her own part, Russia has two major reasons for an even greater suspiciousness than our own. The first of these is little understood, although we pointed to it many months ago. It consists of the weakness of Russia's position in the Far East and our insistence upon exploiting that weakness. The United States, with England as a very junior partner and with the British Dominions playing equally minor rôles, is running Japan. Russia has no genuine part in it, and she must look upon this situation as giving us a vast mass of maneuver against her in the Pacific, especially since it makes more or less available to us several million trained Japanese soldiers. Since Americans habitually look upon themselves as peace-loving, it is hard for us to conceive how serious this threat is in the eyes of a government not at all convinced that we really are peace-loving. And the second Russian ground for suspicion is the atomic bomb itself.

Here, then, is the explosive situation which confronts us at the very moment of victory, and at the moment we had all so earnestly hoped for as the beginning of at least a long respite from war. What political solution can the three gentlemen about to confer in Washington find?

Of all the proposals so far made that contained in an article in the November *Atlantic Monthly* appears to us as the most statesmanlike. The article takes the form of an interview with Dr. Albert Einstein. He says: "The secret of the bomb should be committed to a world government and the United States should immediately announce its readiness to give it to a world government. This government should be founded by the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain—the only three powers with great military strength. The fact that there are only three nations with great military power should make it easier rather than harder to establish such a government. Since the United States and Great Britain have the secret of the atomic bomb and the Soviet Union does not, they should invite the Soviet Union to prepare and present the first draft of a constitution for the proposed world government. That action should help to dispel the distrust which the Russians already feel because the bomb is being kept a secret, chiefly to prevent their having it. Obviously the first draft would not be the final one, but the Russians should be made to feel that the world government would assure them their security." Dr. Einstein elaborates this idea in some detail, and clearly defines the powers of his proposed world government: it "would have power over all military matters and need have only one further power: the power to intervene in countries where a minority is oppressing a majority and creating the kind of instability that leads to war." He feels that this situation does not exist in Russia, even though he admits that in Russia a minority rules, for he does not feel that this minority rule is, as was Hitler's, one necessarily conducive to war. That, of course, is the crux of the matter. But whether Einstein is right or wrong, clearly the duty of statesmanship today is to try every expedient which could possibly avert cataclysm.

Raising National Production

THERE is no denying one contention in full-page advertisements run in a number of leading American newspapers by General Motors. The nation must produce more peacetime goods than ever if there is to be national prosperity or even a going economy. But is the way to hike production to lengthen the work week?

During the war the longer week did increase production; more money in the workers' pockets even raised materially the total purchases of civilian goods. There is a fatal flaw, however, in any argument which would deduce from this that such a system could continue to function under peacetime conditions. Where do the 10,000,000 returning servicemen come in? They must have a rôle in our economy.

Bargainers, of course, often set their sights too high. Mr. Wilson's appeal for a forty-five hour week with a six percent hourly wage increase is no answer to the demand of the United Auto Workers for a wage increase of thirty percent. But whatever the final figure mutually agreed upon (the Reconversion Advisory Board finds that industry generally can increase wages 24 percent without raising prices), there is a question here of basic economic principle: Is the long work week the key to adequately increased national production?

The real factor in increasing national production is, of course, the expansion of consumer demand. In other words more men and women gainfully employed at a living wage. Lengthening the work week would on the contrary curtail employment. The great threat to our economy is unemployment. At its face value the GM proposal is nothing short of wild-eyed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Leopold and the Belgians

The King and the Parties as seen by one firsthand observer

B. Hollants

ONE INCIDENT which will go down as a milestone in the political history of Belgium is the decision of the Catholic Party (which has become since then, as we shall see, the new Christian Social Party) to withdraw from the government coalition called *Union Nationale*. The former Catholic Party, which constituted in the heart of the Belgian Parliament the strongest and most important group, and which for more than seventy years was a component part of every ministry, has by this decision put an end to the series of coalition governments of the three traditional parties which controlled the destinies of Belgium from the beginning of the war. By this break the Catholic Party has brought back in full vigor the traditional rules of democratic government, which is not normally thought of without an opposition party.

The incident which led to this withdrawal is none other than the decision of the government majority, comprising the Socialist, Liberal and Communist Parties, to submit the question of the return of King Leopold III as head of the State to a preliminary vote of the Parliament. The powers and prerogatives of the King are clearly stated in the Belgian Constitution. To him belongs the executive power as it is defined by the Constitution. The person of the King is inviolable; his ministers are responsible. No act of the King can have the force of law if it is not countersigned by a minister, who, by that act alone, makes himself responsible for it. The King, who before mounting the throne must take an oath to respect the Constitution and laws of the Belgian people, has powers which are much more limited than those of other heads of state, such as the American President. Yet the Constitution confers upon him another right: that of commanding the nation's armed forces. It was in this capacity as Commander-in-Chief of the Belgian Army that King Leopold saw that he was forced, after a stubborn resistance of 18 days, to capitulate with his army before the invader's crushing superiority in numbers and matériel.

That it was absolutely impossible for the King to decide otherwise was admitted at the time by the whole Belgian people. They learned of his action with profound gratitude. Not because the Belgian people did not want to oppose the German invader with all their strength (they proved in the months that followed that they wished only to continue the battle at the side of the Allies), but because they knew, they saw with their own eyes, that the unequal struggle would have no other result but the total and absolutely useless destruction of the Belgian Army which had already suffered grave losses. They saw that continued resistance would also mean the death of 3,000,000 civilians, shelterless refugees for the most part on the roads of Flanders, all mixed in with army corps in the confined theater of operations comprised in the triangle: Bruges, Courtrai, Dunkirk. Besides, no one down to the present moment has dared to question the opportuneness of this surrender.

Some politicians reproached the King for not having followed his ministers into exile in order to carry on with them the battle against Germany. Leopold himself replied to this reproach in a proclamation May 28, 1940, to the effect that as head of the army he preferred to share the fate of his soldiers and to remain in the midst of his people in the difficult days which they were to face. Truth requires that I say that this attitude was appreciated at its just worth by the Belgian people, who felt they had been abandoned by a large number of their representatives who, having taken flight toward France and England, had left the country without directives and without leaders.

It is a further question what would have become of the Belgian resistance if the King had followed his ministers into France knowing—something which documents have just now revealed—that the ministers in question had in mind at a given moment to follow the example of France and conclude an armistice with Germany. The hesitations of this ministerial group wandering over the roads of France, and certain of whom are at this moment the most active leaders in the campaign against Leopold, comprise an inglorious page in the story of the Belgian emigration of 1940.

Thanks to the energetic stand of the King, this evil was avoided and Belgium did not follow France along the path of official or semi-official collaboration. But on May 29, 1940, the hearts of the people were profoundly troubled. Paul Reynaud, President of the French Council, an-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nounced over the radio the capitulation of the Belgian Army. He happened to present the course of events in a manner most outrageous for the Belgian people and their King, whom he accused of being "a criminal King," who had betrayed the cause of the Allies by surrendering in the field without notifying the commanders of the French and British forces. All these accusations have been completely refuted by direct witnesses of this tragedy, and notably by the reports of Lord Roger Keyes, delegate of the English Command at Belgian Army Headquarters. M. Reynaud failed to tell the French people and the entire world that it was the inadequacy of the French defenses and the breakthrough of the Germans at Sedan which had forced the Belgian Command to withdraw its troops from its best line of defense; and that it was the total collapse of the French armies in the north that had brought about the hopeless situation in which the Belgian Army found itself.

But this campaign of disparagement and of gross insult undertaken the same day by the whole French press also had its repercussions in Belgian politics. The Belgian Parliament, whose members in large part met at Limoges deep in France, convened officially. After a stormy session in which the only element was the version of the capitulation which had been transmitted to it by the French Government, the Parliament allowed itself to be persuaded to cast a vote stigmatizing the attitude of the King, etc. When this vote became known in Belgium after the French capitulation, it aroused a wave of indignation and popular anger against the members of Parliament who had taken part, and from then on they were designated as "Limogeards."

However, we must recall here that once the great majority of these representatives had returned home and learned of the conditions under which the King had felt obliged to surrender, they did not hesitate to send him a joint letter of apology and regret. I must also point out that the only Belgian minister who never doubted our final victory, and who on his own initiative immediately went to England long before the French capitulation (in order to organize there the resistance of the Belgian Congo), M. de Vleeschouwer, Minister for the Colonies, is among those who in the recent debate defended the King with the greatest vigor.

In accordance with the stipulations of the surrender, the King was made prisoner with his army and was himself interned in the Royal Castle of Laeken. The Government in Exile, after extensive wanderings, was finally installed at London. On several occasions in official publications drawn up under official auspices, and in the talks addressed to the Belgian people by Prime Minister Pierlot and Foreign Minister Spaak, the Government publicly expressed its sentiments of loyalty to the person of the King and defended him against those attacks. Moreover, it was this attitude of the Government, formally recognizing the wrong which it had committed at Limoges and asking the Belgian people to unite around the King, which permitted a reconciliation between the Belgians in Belgium and those in London. In May, 1944, the King and his children were suddenly deported by the Gestapo and taken to Germany. From then on until Germany completely collapsed, the Belgian people had no news at all of Leopold. The whole country was preparing to give the King a triumphal welcome.

No one at that moment expected the least opposition of any fraction of the population to the return of the King to his country and his throne. When it was learned in Belgium that the King and the royal family had been liberated by the armies of General Patch, there were unprecedented manifestations of loyalty to him. Not a single house failed to display at least one picture of Leopold III.

Suddenly a few newspapers began a campaign to discredit the King. They spoke of a certain member of the royal household whose attitude during the course of the occupation, if it had anything reprehensible about it, could not be in any way imputed to the King. They made certain insinuations for which they furnished not the slightest proof and which certainly are in complete contrast to the indisputably established acts and attitudes of the King, the authenticity of which cannot be doubted by anyone.

★

They spoke, for example, of the visit which the King paid to Hitler toward the end of 1940. According to statements made on this subject by persons in the King's entourage whose word cannot be doubted, the King decided to take this extremely painful step in order to obtain a betterment of the lot of his soldiers who were prisoners and at the same time to protest against a scarcity of foodstuffs in Belgium which threatened to reach catastrophic proportions. It was a step, then, inspired solely by humanitarian sentiments. Use is now being made of German reports drawn up in 1945—five years later—in which it seems that Hitler at that moment had broached certain political problems. The deduction was that the King, who considered himself a prisoner and therefore without power to rule, might have been guilty of a political act.

This campaign in the newspapers, as controlled as a ballet, had immediate repercussions. The Communist Party, which exploits every occasion to provoke disorder, took the lead in demanding the dethronement of the King, and with great fanfare threatened the country with bloody up-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

risings and a general strike. Then the Socialist Party demanded that the government exert pressure on the King voluntarily to abdicate. Finally, the government majority yielded in the face of these threats and declared that it could not guarantee the maintenance of order if the King returned. Following these actions *l'affaire royale* was brought before Parliament and the supporters and enemies of the King made their arguments without any practical result. Unhappily the question of the King, which is strictly a constitutional question, is in danger of becoming a party question.

The Belgian Parliament, elected in 1939 for a period of four years, is comprised at this moment of 73 members from the Catholic Party, 64 Socialists, 33 Liberals and 9 Communists. The Catholic Party is a group with a very advanced social program, strong in the defense of constitutional liberties, and motivated by the principles of Christian humanism. Before the war this party was set up on the basis of social groups—Christian workers, the peasantry, the middle classes—and it had a strictly confessional character. Since 1939 it has been completely transformed. It has become unitary, the affiliation of its members being direct and individual; it has not retained the former duality necessitated by the ethnic makeup of Belgium. (The new party will have, then, as it did formerly, a Flemish wing and a Walloon wing, but it will have only one president.) The party has also frankly abandoned its confessional character and has opened its ranks to all those who rally to its political program regardless of religious belief or philosophical tenets. That is a means of enlarging its field of action and the potentialities of enlisting members in the new Christian Social Party.

The Socialist Party, which before the war was called the Belgian Workers Party, is according to its doctrines a revolutionary party based on orthodox Marxism and anti-monarchism. The great majority of its leaders are affiliated with the Masonic lodges (which in Belgium, as in France, have a clearly anti-religious character). That explains their policy of anti-religious sectarianism, which often leads them to make political agreements with the Liberal Party, whose political doctrine is as different as can be. This old fashioned anti-clericalism is manifested most patently on educational questions (opposition to the teaching of religion) and the refusal to grant subsidies for the free education instituted by the Church which the great majority of the youth of the country enjoys.

Since before the war, and under the influence of its former president, Henri de Man, and Foreign Minister Spaak, the party has a decided tendency to abandon its orthodox Marxism in order to engage resolutely in gradual social reform and national socialism. For opportunistic reasons (the great popularity of the Belgian dynasty) the Socialist Party has never had recourse in its proclamations to republican or anti-royalist principles. In the heart of the party there is a rebirth of the influence of the old doctrinaires (de Brouckère, Huysmans, etc.), who have in large part determined the party's attitude on the question of the King. This situation is due to the disappearance of de Man and part of his disciples, who at the beginning of the occupation clearly adopted a collaborationist attitude. M. de Man fled to Switzerland and some of his best known collaborators have been thrown into prison in Belgium.

The Liberal Party, historically the party of Manchester economics, is essentially the party of doctrinaire anti-clericalism, of Masonic lodges, somewhat comparable in its political tendencies to the Radical and Radical Socialist Parties in France.

*

There is every reason to admit that the debate on the question of the King was a coup prearranged by men pursuing ends they would not dare to avow—notably the abolition of the monarchical system, which is the bond of national unity. Before the war there were enemies of Belgian unity among the Flemish nationalists, a large number of whom became compromised in collaborationist movements; now the enemies of this unity come from the Walloon extremists who dream of transforming the Belgian State into a federal republic—certain ones even wish to annex the Walloons to France. Naturally the monarchy constitutes the greatest obstacle to these projects. On the other hand, it is well known that the heads of this movement belong exclusively to those Walloon wings of the Socialist and Liberal Parties which raised the question of the monarchy for the first time.

Everyone in Belgium admits, without being able to prove it to the hilt, that certain foreign influences, especially French influences, have played a part in the debate—just as French influence is acknowledged in the rebirth of the separatist and annexationist tendencies among the Walloons.

Many socialist and liberal members of Parliament in sheer self-defense and party discipline have adopted a position in line with that taken by the leadership of their party in the Parliament debates. Still others, such as M. Albert Devèze, the Liberal leader, have taken a comparable stand as a purely opportunistic means of maintaining order, doubtless out of fear that the return of the King would bring about communist troubles and strikes and might gravely hamper the rehabilitation of the country and its economic restoration.

The Catholic Party has held to a strictly constitutional program. By virtue of the Constitution,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Leopold III is head of the Belgian State. If the King is unable to rule, the ministers, after having had his inability proclaimed, immediately convoke Parliament. The question of regency or guardianship is up to the joint session of both houses of Parliament. But the inability to rule under which the King suffered because of his captivity has come to an end. It is a question of a purely physical fact, whose ascertainment requires no intervention whatever by Parliament. It is so evident that from the moment the impossibility of ruling comes to an end the King automatically returns to power, that the Constitution does not even provide for such a situation. It is this thesis, namely that the King automatically returns to the throne, which was defended so vigorously by the Catholic Party.

It has been thought that in view of the fissures created by the campaigns in the papers and the parliamentary debates it would be useful to organize a popular referendum. Not that the result would have the force of law but that it would have the great advantage of making known the sentiments of the people themselves. The question put to the Belgian electorate would be phrased: "Do you wish the return of King Leopold III to the throne?"

The majority groups in Parliament declared they could not support this proposal. It is obvious that this negative attitude is inspired by the fear that the immense majority of the people would declare itself in favor of the immediate and unconditional return of King Leopold. On several occasions the Socialist and Liberal leaders and the Prime Minister, M. van Acker himself, have publicly acknowledged that the majority of the country without question would wish this return and do remain loyal to the person of the King. But all these constitutional and democratic considerations did not prevent the majority from casting a vote in Parliament to the effect that "the impossibility of ruling in which the King finds himself," which had already been proclaimed by Parliament at the time of its meeting at Limoges, would not cease except through a new act of intervention by Parliament.

The King has preferred to remain outside the country for the time being and has asked his brother, Prince Charles, to continue to act as Regent. The solution of the problem has been postponed. It still must be settled by the Belgian people.

★

The present Parliament does not represent the Belgian people either actually or legally. To take only the question of the King as an instance—for this is also the crucial political problem upon whose solution depends in large part the continued existence of the Belgian State—it is all too plain that the parliamentary majority is in complete disagreement with the majority of the people, whom the government does not dare to consult. But legally this Parliament should have come up for reelection in 1943. The Catholics and the Communists on several occasions insisted on a speedy recourse to the polls in order to give the electorate the chance to declare itself on the policy which the Government had followed and would follow. It must be added that one party of the people is no longer represented in Parliament because some 30 deputies have been deprived of their mandate as a result of the attitude they maintained during the occupation.

Claiming that it is physically impossible to have elections at the present moment (despite the fact that the country has been liberated for more than a year), the Government has postponed them until March, 1946. The fear of the voter, who supports the King, has much to do with this decision to put off popular consultation until spirits are calmer.

The present Parliament was elected in 1939 by voting lists drawn up several months before; all men under 28 years of age therefore have never taken part in an election. The same is true for women, who before the war could only vote for the local communal councils. The Catholic Party has demanded the end of this flagrant injustice, which places the Belgian woman from a political point of view in an inferior position. The previous Government had formally promised to remedy this situation and to give the vote to all women over 21 years of age. Thus the new electoral body will be comprised, two-thirds at least, of elements who have never before been called to the polls.

However, the Government has sought by simple decree to deprive of the right to vote a series of people called "inciviques," that is to say, citizens whose patriotism might not have been beyond reproach during the occupation. According to the text of the decree prepared by the Ministry of Justice, it is estimated that some 400,000 citizens would be affected by these measures.

The members of the Catholic Party still insist on constitutional principle in this question, and hold that a citizen cannot be deprived of his political rights merely by a decision of the judiciary. They rightly claim that in going against these principles the nation will be exposed to the most arbitrary action and to the danger of a disguised dictatorship conducted by a government which will be democratic only in name.

One of the gravest problems for postwar Belgium is the prosecution of those who are held guilty of collaborating with the enemy. In France, a country of 40,000,000 inhabitants, where collaboration reached a degree at least as great as that in Belgium, they were content to indict some 60,000 individuals. In Belgium they have obviously been over-zealous in drawing up some

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

300,000 dossiers, which seems to indicate that a considerable number of citizens must have adopted a disloyal attitude during the occupation. Immediately after liberation some 100,000 were thrown into prison, without counting the thousands of dismissals from employment and refusals to hire which teachers, functionaries, lawyers and others have suffered.

These 100,000 persons accused of being unpatriotic must be sheltered and fed. Belgium, a decent country, had not foreseen the day when it would be organizing concentration camps. At most it was possible to shelter in reasonable fashion some 6,000 of the accused. After having crowded them in together, it was necessary to break up the congestion. For this purpose certain categories were set up; and finally those who were held were divided into "presumed guilty," "suspects," etc. But when it came to releasing those who could be reproached only with a simple misdemeanor of opinion or those who were sheer victims of false denunciations, the authorities encountered again and again the opposition of the die-hards of certain journals which lent themselves to the ebb and flow of the pressures of demagogic forces. The great majority of the Belgians believe that it is time to put an end to these arbitrary practices which recall too vividly the past.

Toward Full Employment

A blueprint aimed at utilizing our capacity to produce

Sidney Aberman

WHY DOES IT take either a costly war or a reckless spree to give us a fleeting taste of prosperity? Economists say we have depressions because money gets bogged down in undesirable places and not enough of it is spent to buy up in full what has been produced. Money flows back and forth through three main divisions: consumers, business, government. This circle proves vicious or beneficial depending on how reliably the flow responds to needs. Ordinarily, if no gaping deficiencies occur in one place or idle surpluses in another, the economy may be said to be enjoying good business and full employment. The moment, though, a significant amount of money is tucked away in unproductive nest eggs or reserves by either individuals, business or government, all sections are affected, with the result that the circle dips into a downward spiral hurling us headlong into depression.

For example, suppose 135 billion dollars' worth of goods intended for general consumption is produced next year. Because of our overall tendency, both corporate and individual, to save more and spend too little, the chances are only some 127 billions' worth will actually be bought up by the consuming public. The eight billion shortage resulting will mean that the following year roughly 127 billions in consumer goods will be turned out. But when business trims its sails men are laid off, and employees are consumers. Consumption will therefore fall short of even the 127 billions required to buy up the complete products. Business will have to cut down again, more layoffs will occur, and so on down the line. The decline will come to a halt only when enough savings have been wiped out to restore the balance with spending. But by then we will be up to our necks in bankruptcies, piddling stop-gaps, miserable relief and grim social unrest.

Certain economists have worked out a program, with business, as well as labor, blessing, under which the government, far from hampering or trying to take over private business, actually stimulates and encourages individual initiative to provide the jobs itself. No startling innovations are involved, merely extensions and adaptations of the traditional revenue and spending functions of the government. The ordinary peacetime processes of government—regulation of banking and currency, taxation, social legislation, plus the various expenditures included—have always influenced the nation's consumption and production totals for good or ill. Ignored before, now largely through the efforts of Keynes and Beveridge in England and Hansen and Pierson in this country this influence has come to be widely appreciated.

What is proposed is simply that these usual processes of government be employed as counterbalances to throw their weight against undesired tendencies toward underconsumption, bringing the scales back in line. Exactly how this is done will be explained directly. At this point it should be stressed that the program calls for *minimum* government regulation, designed to assist and encourage *private* spending and investment. It does not require a second mushrooming of the wartime manpower, rationing, priority and overall production boards now in process of being dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continued. It does not propose that the government take over and operate plants. It does not compel men to work anywhere or guarantee them *specific* jobs. Nor does it empower the government to fix specific profits, prices, wages, markets or production quotas.

What, then, does it do?

> "Employment depends on spending, which is of two kinds—for consumption and investment; what people spend on consumption gives employment. What they save, i.e., do not spend on consumption, gives employment only if it is invested. . . ."

In these two sentences Sir William Beveridge gives us the gist of John Maynard Keynes's approach, which set him right in his own thinking about unemployment. Beveridge has since taken his own path, but the insight remains to guide us in setting up a different type of economic gyroscope for stabilizing the flow of spending and investment money necessary to keep the business world from rocking between spree and slump.

We may start by assuming that business can be counted on to produce, so long as money-backed demand wants its products and nothing else gets in the way. For an aroused and intelligent government the primary job is therefore:

(a) to see that the necessity quantity of quick-moving currency keeps getting into consumer hands,

(b) to clear away tax and monopolistic obstructions to business expansion and to offer direct inducements to private investment, and

(c) in case the first two need supplementing, to launch public works projects in fields of universally acknowledged benefit to the nation.

A periodic canvass must first of all be made of the economy in order to determine how great the need is at any time. No serious difficulties are presented by such a task, since statisticians can now make the desired estimates with all necessary accuracy. The figures arrived at from such a study of actual conditions are then compared with what would be needed to provide full employment.

Suppose, for example, the existing labor force is 60 million and the government wants to take action after unemployment has reached five million. (We are not counting an unpreventable turnover of some two million people changing jobs.) Something like the following table would be drawn up (only, of course, with great precision and in detail):

	ACTUAL	DESIRED	NEEDED
Employment	55 mil.	60 mil.	5 mil.
Production	170 bil.	185 bil.	15 bil.
Consumer spending	125 bil.	135 bil.	10 bil.
Private investment	22½ bil.	25 bil.	2½ bil.
Government spending	22½ bil.	25 bil.	2½ bil.

(The bottom item on Government Spending refers to spending for goods and services and embraces local and state as well as federal government.)

Our immediate objective would be to concentrate on the last three figures in the right hand column. Raising consumer spending by 10 billions, private investment by 2½ billions and government spending by another 2½ billions would wipe out the 15 billion production deficiency and give jobs to the 5 million unemployed.

How would we go about raising the needed amounts of consumer spending, private investment and government spending? Here's where we get down to cases. The President and Congress, in consultation with representatives from business, labor, agriculture and state and local governments, launch the following three-pronged attack:

OBJECTIVE A—10 *billion more dollars in consumer hands.*

1. Six billions in reduced, repealed or refunded taxes of the kind that hit consumers hardest, plus a shift in the tax base so that revenue comes out of funds that would be saved instead of cutting into spending money.

This involves eliminating altogether the inequitable sales and property taxes, and relying instead on private and corporate income taxes, with the exemption raised to leave out personal incomes that are below the minimum recommended standard of living.

2. Four billions in higher wages and small-farm income, the main ingredients of purchasing power.

This can be obtained by encouraging collective bargaining, passing higher minimum wage laws, stimulating the growth of consumer and farmer cooperatives (natural monopoly busters and income distributors) and other assistance to low income farmers.

OBJECTIVE B—2½ *billion more dollars in private investments.*

1. Incentive taxation.

Taxes would be reduced on business earnings that are distributed as dividends or genuinely invested in plant and equipment. Taxes would be proportionately higher on monopoly profits and undistributed earnings. No tax favors would be given bond income over stock income. Special tax consideration would be shown new business.

2. Lower interest rates.

This would make loan capital more easily available for business expansion and for men with sound new ideas.

3. Anti-trust action.

A vigorous campaign would be undertaken by the Department of Justice to break up all monopolies and cartels, as well as every attempt on their part to limit competition, restrict production and hike prices.

OBJECTIVE C—2½ *billions of local, state and federal government spending* to remove any margin of unemployment left after A and B have been applied.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A public works program would be inaugurated, but no WPA. It would operate through private contractors and encourage democratic control by those who benefit directly by it, as with the TVA. It would provide respectable employment at good wages and produce goods and services of unquestionable value to the nation in the fields of health, housing, education, conservation and social security. To avoid heavy carrying charges, it would be financed either through money borrowed without interest or through private savings that were not being invested borrowed at very low rates.

Here, in outline, is the economics of full employment. The amounts given are, of course, arbitrary, and the illustration leaves many details to be worked out, but it gives a good indication of the actual steps that would be taken under the plan to meet definite needs as they are likely to arise in the near future. In case individual measures proposed seem disappointingly familiar, it should be remembered that what we are dealing with here is their effect on the nation's budget, how, in other words, they would add or take away from the total amount of goods produced or the amount of savings invested.

The trouble is, up to now there has been no recognized budget for the whole country. The American economy has been a business run without benefit of bookkeeping. Once our suggested accounting system is set up, every proposal listed above becomes an entry able to be measured and maneuvered.

Finally, since excessive spending can be over-inflationary by bidding up prices until they get out of hand, and since too much private investment at one time can lead to overbuildings, with the result that whole industries are washed up for a long time to come, the measures suggested are to be applied to the degree necessary to remove the given deficiencies and no more. They may even be reversed. There is no truth, accordingly, in the accusation that behind its noble-sounding veneer lurks a scheme for unlimited government spending designed to badly unbalance the budget and to undermine our whole competitive market economy.

★

In spite of the impressive evidence to the contrary amassed by the advocates of full employment, the gloomy conviction continues to be spread around that no cure for unemployment exists short of a type of government planning under which individual liberty is destroyed. Depressions—so runs a report recently approved by the New York State Commerce Commission—are the price we pay for freedom. America must choose between "free enterprise and full employment guaranteed by the government," says the research director of a leading business association. The country is being taken down the "road to serfdom."

Citizens who saw their life's savings wiped out in '33 do not regard the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as a threat to their liberties. And citizens who will not again quietly accept the liquidation of their jobs and sources of income have no patience with this paralyzing tyranny of words. They are ready to extend the insurance principle to cover their jobs and the prosperity of the nation. They know that better than any other immediately applicable remedy thus far suggested, the stabilizers listed above can give business what—hampered as it has been by speculation, periodic disappearance of markets, monopolistic and other restrictions on competition, and well-meaning but half-baked government experiments—business has never before fully enjoyed: real opportunity to provide all the jobs.

The Place of Splendor

Little one, wait.
Let me assure you this is not the way
To gain the terminal of outer day.

Its single gate
Lies in your soul, and you must rise and go
By inward passage from what earth you know.

The steps lead down
Through valley after valley, far and far
Past the five countries where the pleasures are.

And past all known
Maps of the mind and every colored chart
And past the final outcry of the heart.

No soul can view
Its own geography; love does not live
In places open and informative.

Yet, being true,
It grants to each its Raphael across
The mist and night through unknown lands of loss.

Walk till you hear
Light told in music that was never heard
And softness spoken that was not a word.

The soul grows clear
When its five senses have been fused in one:
Savor and scent and sound to splendor run.

The smothered roar
Of the eternities, their vast unrest
And infinite peace are deep in your own breast.

That light-swept shore
Will shame the data of grief upon your scroll.
Child, have none told you? *God* is in your soul.

JESSICA POWERS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communications

FEEDING EUROPE

TO the Editors: I cannot grasp the meaning of the following passage in D. H. Moseley's kind and interesting review of my book, *"Italy and the Coming World"* (October 26): "it is evident that he stresses less the Italians' love for the United States and their spiritual kinship with Latin France than their actual need of Great Britain." I think I have stressed very strongly not only our gratitude to Americans, but also Italy's actual need of the United States since most of the economic help, and much of the political aid for the rehabilitation of Italy must come from America. This is evident to the responsible men in Washington and in Rome; but American policy towards Italy has often been hampered by two opposing policies: that of considering Italy Great Britain's sphere of influence, in which the United States would have only a secondary rôle; and that of feeling unable to trust Italy as a free and reliable nation because she is not yet on her feet.

However, if we have received any help from UNRRA (granted at the Montreal Conference in September 1944), if the new UNRRA appropriation for Italian needs (not yet approved by Congress) is larger than the first, and if we have been allowed some credit (about one hundred million dollars), it has all been due to the efforts of the American Government.

My criticism has been and still is that help comes too late and too little, and the consequences are or will be harmful to Italy and Europe. The United States, too, will suffer for her lack of consistency, courage and speed in her international policy.

Even now that the peace treaty with Italy has been indefinitely postponed, the American State Department favors a provisional peace and the dropping of the obsolete secret terms of the Armistice. But fear of Moscow's opposition, of Paris's technicality, and London's hesitation keeps Washington from taking the initiative to remedy the strange situation in which Italy is obliged to remain.

Since I am writing on Italian affairs permit me to thank you for the editorial "Time for Direct Action" (which coincides with my friendly criticism of American hesitation) in which you appeal for the tangible help of "Gift Packages" to the Italians.

May I add some odd instances? To date such packages may be sent only to Vatican City, Rome, Naples, any town or village in Sicily and Sardinia. The latter provision for the two Islands was proposed by the Italian Government in July, was accepted by the American Administration in August, but published in the newspapers only in October and to date many of the American Post Offices do not have the forms necessary for such packages.

Furthermore: The American citizen is allowed to send a gift package of eleven pounds to any European country except Italy where only a four-pound package is permitted. The opposition to increasing the weight of packages to Italy does not come from Washington but from the Allied Commission which feels that the Italian postal service is not organized well enough to permit more than four pounds, whereas Greece, Poland, Estonia, Russia, etc., are supposed to have good and well equipped postal services.

The real reason is the Allied Commission's refusal to give the Italian Postal Administration a little more gasoline which (they claim) is necessary for "military" purposes in Italy.

I close this long letter begging readers to send some four-pound packages to the two orphanages in my home town at the following addresses:

1. Istituto Salesiano "Domenico Savio" (for boys)
   Piazzale Sant' Agostino
   Caltagirone
   Sicily, Italy
2. Orfanotrofio San Luigi (for girls)
   Piazzale Santa Maria di Gesú
   Caltagirone
   Sicily, Italy

With cordial thanks.

LUIGI STURZO.

New York, N. Y.

TO the Editors: In connection with Foreign Secretary Bevin's speech in Parliament on conditions in Germany, I wonder how many of your readers are aware that private relief organizations are not allowed into either Germany or Japan to assist the German and Japanese people? I have talked with the War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, with the National War Fund headquarters and with the Quakers. Relief organizations are allowed to assist the "displaced persons" in Germany . . . but they cannot obtain a "license" to work among the Germans themselves and they are not allowed in Japan at all.

I should like to know who is responsible for refusing this "license."

The delay of Congress in appropriating funds for UNRRA seems a sufficient blot on our nation, without its being made illegal to perform the works of mercy. From a practical point of view, if we are to live in "one world" with our former enemies, it seems incredibly shortsighted to drive them to despair of the humanity of democratic governments.

HENRIETTA DANA RAYMOND.

END OF LEND-LEASE

Crickhowell, Wales.

TO the Editors: I have been "inspired" by your leader in THE COMMONWEAL for September 7 on the end of Lend-Lease to give you an account of how one Englishwoman typical of many has lived during six years of war, and is still living. I am the wife of Donald Attwater, your frequent contributor.

How well I remember hearing President Roosevelt's first broadcast in the spring of 1941 when he declared: "Britain needs food. Britain shall have food." I knew we should be all right. And we *have* been all right. What should we have done without American Spam, American dried eggs and milk, American pork?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The cessation of Lend-Lease came as a blow. As much a spiritual blow as a material one; and I think we feel rather bitter that now America, almost unscathed by the war, can retire into a splendid isolation and leave us hungry—and puzzled.

For the sake of the Very Old and Very Young we left London in 1939, and have lived in a damp farm cottage in the Welsh mountains with no modern amenities. The floors are stone and we are allowed enough coal for one fire. Our rooms are lighted somewhat dimly by oil lamps and I have an oil cooking stove (American).

Of course we have been "safe" here—some of us, but it is a strenuous and monotonous life. Every fortnight a van delivers groceries, flour, etc.; our grocery parcel is small, our rations being:

Butter	2 ounces per week
Margarine	4 " " "
Lard	1 ounce " "
Bacon	3 ounces " "
Cheese	2 " " "
Sugar	8 " " "

But those are supplemented by a certain amount of canned fish (American), canned beans (American) and a strange product of wartime factories labeled "Sausagemeat."

Everything else I bring up on my bicycle. Six days a week I cycle down to the tiny town of Crickhowell, in all weathers, rain, high winds, bright sun—evening fogs; six mornings I go questing for food. One day I might find some fish, another half a pound of liver. Or another I get a sheep's head, which, with a good deal of trouble and some skill, makes excellent "Scotch broth." Occasionally a few *oranges!* Bread too has to be carried up and on Saturdays the weekly meat ration. Daily I get a newspaper and those indispensable comforts in difficult times, cigarettes.

The operative word in the previous paragraph is "Up." The last three-quarters of a mile it is indeed Up; and up I push my bike laden pannier-wise with two bags hanging from my handle-bars. "Is it uphill all the way? To the very end!" And unlike Christian my pack doesn't drop off, but when I eventually arrive and push my bike into the shed and stagger in with my shopping, I do the dropping and am regaled with fresh coffee; thank Heaven, unrationed.

I have been to no cities or even large towns, no theaters, hardly any films, for six years; we have had no new furniture or furnishings—our sheets are patched and darned; our clothes really shabby. There just hasn't been time or opportunity—or money to buy goods at high prices.

This is not meant to be a "hard luck" story, but a statement of fact; and of course the above are only a few of the hard facts of fundamental daily life. It is no less a fact that our apprehension of the truth that the body is more than the raiment, and life more than meat, is immensely heightened. For one thing, shopping has become an adventure; I may come home from Crickhowell in a triumphant mood that never could have been mine when shops were full of good things, exclaiming "Just look what I have found today!" And the family is duly thrilled at the cheerful aspect of a pound of tomatoes, a yard of elastic or a packet of good writing paper.

Still more we may climb up a neighboring mountain to a small yellow farmhouse perched on the four winds of Heaven, where we always receive the warmest of welcomes from an hospitable farmer's wife, who gives us a lovely tea of home-made bread and butter and fruit tarts. We help her milk her Welsh cows, turn the separator, have a drink of quite delicious frothy milk warm from the cow; and after a hearty good-bye and a cordial invitation to come again soon, we swing down the mountain paths under a frosty moon carrying, Oh joy! a couple of fresh eggs. (A Welsh couple is always more than two.) And dare I whisper it, sometimes a pail of farm butter. Actually farmers are not allowed by law to give away butter, and it needn't be broadcast if I can help out tea-drinkers with my own tea. The Government hasn't exactly encouraged us to be "loving and giving." It has been illegal to share our rations!

DOROTHY ATTWATER.

CATHOLIC BOOK WEEK

New York, N. Y.

TO the Editors: As part of the Catholic Book Week program for November 4-10, reproduction of the prize winning poster, "Keys to World Peace—Christian Books," will be on display in many of the public library branches in New York. A short annotated list of Catholic books, compiled by the Catholic Book Week Committee of librarians, can be had upon request in all of the library branches in Manhattan, Bronx and Staten Island.

CATHERINE MCMANMON,
Chairman, CBW Committee.

The Screen

Grue for Grownups

IT IS GOOD to see a couple of mystery films that were directed by intelligent movie makers and designed for adults. Perhaps some kind of awards should go to their producers, directors, writers, casts and all concerned for raising the lowly who-dun-it to an adult plane and giving us entertaining entertainment. And certainly any members of the audience who guess the murderers in these two thrillers should get prizes for astute observation. Both pictures drop well-planted clues, so if you're on your toes you may be able to figure out the guilty person in each case. I hope it is needless for me to warn you to see these films from their opening scenes. You lose the build-up and carefully directed cumulative effects if you pop into a good movie after the plot has started rolling.

When I saw *"And Then There Were None"* I had neither read Agatha Christie's novel nor seen "Ten Little Indians," the play based on it; so I approached the movie with curiosity and was duly rewarded by its suspense and surprises. But what marks the film more than these aspects is its grim humor, a characteristic in which Director René Clair is a master. Both Dudley Nichols, who wrote the script, and Clair allow the camera to reveal character and situation; this is not merely a filmed novel. In fact, the movie's first words: "What a quiet place," are spoken by June Duprez long after we have met the principal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

characters on the boat coming out to the island (which turns out to be no quiet place in the usual sense). Ten people are gathered on this lonely island; each of them is accused by the voice on a phonograph record of having committed a crime connected with undiscovered murder. They realize fate is catching up with them as they are killed off, one by one, and the killings follow the pattern of the diminishing Indians in the nursery rhyme. This disquieting sense of inevitability is further heightened by their unknown assailant who mysteriously breaks one of ten Indian figurines after each death. The situation becomes more tense after the first three murders (of characters played by Mischa Auer, Queenie Leonard, C. Aubrey Smith) when the remaining seven are certain that their host and killer must be one of themselves! Then fear and suspicion are added to the discomforting atmosphere. Which of us is acting like a cruel god dishing out his own idea of justice? Is it that tight-lipped puritanical old maid (Judith Anderson)? Or is it the butler, the doctor, the judge, the detective? The cast who enact these rôles have been chosen with care and give praiseworthy performances. My only gripe is with Mischa Auer who overplays the Russian to the point of absurdity. When I met René Clair later and asked him about this, he explained that this was done purposely to detract from the horror of the ten foreshadowed murders by making the first victim a clown. For my money, this plan failed. Comedy relief appears often in this tight plot—through the childish rhyme in itself and through such lovely gruesome moments as when the butler (Richard Haydn) asks, after the killings start mounting up, "How many will you be for dinner tonight?" The funniest sequence reveals a circle of eavesdroppers: Barry Fitzgerald spying on Walter Huston who is spying on Roland Young who is spying on Louis Hayward who in turn runs around to the starting point to spy on Fitzgerald. Since seeing the movie I read the Christie novel, and should like to note that several changes are made in the film version but these do not detract from the engrossing story.

An appropriate prize for whoever guesses the identity of the murderer in *"Spellbound"* would be the famous fur-lined tea cup! The solution of this unusual movie appears in a dream sequence designed by Dali. Although this wild nightmare (dreamed up by an amnesia victim played by Gregory Peck) is full of enormous eyes, people without faces, blank playing cards and other psychological symbols, the movie on a whole is not surrealistic like those advance-guard films of some twenty years ago. Most of it is a straight forward explanation of how a psychoanalyst goes about his business. And as such, it uses rather dangerous material for popular consumption, mainly because of over-simplification. The movie almost gives the impression that a patient has only to reveal his dreams and presto, he's cured. Furthermore, I doubt if any woman psychiatrist, especially one played so convincingly by Ingrid Bergman, would endanger her professional standing by helping her patient, who was suspected of murder, to evade the police so she could continue her treatments. The scientific matters in "Spellbound" are most likely sound enough, but they're handled rather cursorily. The whole piece has a sort of nervous fascination in spite of flaws in the plot and a great deal of talkiness unexpected in a film directed by Alfred Hitchcock. David O. Selznick's production and the fine cast, led by Bergman and Peck and given first-rate support by Leo Carroll and Michael Chekhov, are up to their high standards. The murder mystery, itself, comes off second best because of the distractions of the psychoanalysis trappings and a couple of other red herrings that are dragged across the plot. Ben Hecht wrote the screenplay from an adaptation of a novel called "The House of Dr. Edwards." You are not really left on your own to interpret our unhappy hero's dream. Drs. Bergman, Chekhov and Carroll supply most of the explanations, and pretty tricky they are at times. However there are other clues that point to the murderer. Director Hitchcock can be relied upon to give us the jitters every now and then, but I should have preferred less verbosity and more pure cinema thrills like the scene in which starry-eyed Peck wanders threateningly around the house with an open razor. "Spellbound" won't make you a nervous wreck, but its well chosen title is no misnomer.

PHILIP T. HARTUNG.

The Morgenthau Plan

GEORGE DOHERTY

OUR GERMAN problem is to cage and hamstring the world beast, isolate, enfeeble and confine the unregenerate criminal. The Germans have forfeited all claims upon our justice and our charity. They are no longer our brothers. This, in brief, is the Morgenthau thesis.*

There is certainly reason enough in the contention that the primary peace problem is to prevent another German aggression. No other nation—not even Japan—has such a history of misbehavior. And Mr. Morgenthau's demonstration of the extraordinary recuperative power of the German war economy after World War I is impressive. But justice demands that the German peace be no harsher than prudence requires. Prudence cannot dictate action now, of the utmost severity, which is only necessary to compensate for our expected failure five or ten years hence to resist German rearmament. We have a right to do the really necessary things now, but we must assume that we shall persevere. We have no right to kill the prisoner because later the task of keeping jail may become too onerous.

How, precisely, does the Morgenthau Plan exceed reasonable precautions? First, it proposes that the Ruhr and surrounding industrial areas (which are to be permanently internationalized)—the "heart of German industrial power"—be "stripped of *all* presently existing industries" and "so weakened and controlled that it cannot in the foreseeable future become an industrial area." In the rest of Germany which is not ceded to Poland, France,

*Germany Is Our Problem. Henry Morgenthau, Jr. Harper. $2.00.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Denmark and the Low Countries, all heavy industry is to be removed or destroyed. The term heavy industry is defined broadly to include all important metallurgical, chemical (other than pharmaceutical) and electrical equipment production and the bulk of electric power. Thus Germany is to be converted into a nation predominantly of small farms.

This is the kind of proposal which clearly foresees an eventual, disastrous weakening of our purpose. The destruction of German industry can and should be selective. Without her armament, aircraft, and shipbuilding industries—all of which are being eliminated under the Potsdam program—and with the metals, chemical, machinery and certain other industries rigidly restricted to approved peacetime needs (as under Potsdam), Germany will not be able to challenge us again. General destruction of German industry (reparations withdrawals are not in question) would only be necessary on the assumption that later our control over its use will be abandoned. We can't, in justice, make that assumption.

Mr. Morgenthau attempts to show that no loss to the world economy would be involved if Germany were to become an agrarian country. He contends that her industrial supremacy has been achieved artificially, through cartels which strangled the development of the other economies, and that the industrial development of other European countries will be enormously hastened by the deindustrialization of Germany. The argument has some merit, but surely the German development owed a great deal to technical and engineering superiority, to certain qualities of the people. If it did, there will be an economic loss involved in forcibly converting them to less skilled occupations. Why not simply do away with the German-dominated cartels and see what Germany, deprived of key war industries, can do on a more competitive footing?

The Ruhr-Rhineland area, besides being stripped of all industry and internationalized, would be evacuated of all Germans—so would the ceded areas. Since no data of the number of persons involved in these shifts are even considered, the proposal in its present form does not deserve to be taken seriously. Mr. Morgenthau is vague about the repopulation of the international area and he fails to say why, if the Germans are moved out, the Ruhr industries must be destroyed.

The most unfortunate recommendation of all is that, while and after accomplishing all these drastic changes in the German economy, changes which properly include the ousting of the German industrial and governmental leadership, the Allies are to refuse to guarantee even minimum conditions of internal order and welfare in Germany. Mr. Morgenthau argues strongly against any assumption of responsibility for "emergency economic controls" over prices, rationing, employment, consumption, housing, etc., on the ground that these would be too difficult to operate; that failure would discredit the Allied Commission; that success would be an even greater evil because it "would mean a more rapid German recovery." Internal economic controls adopted by the Allies should, therefore, be strictly limited to those necessary to effect the purposes of the occupation. In this spirit Mr. Morgenthau might just as well recommend the gas chamber: that would extinguish the possibility of German recovery forever.

For this recommendation the Morgenthau Plan has rightly been dubbed a program for chaos in Germany. Clearly, if the plan were successfully applied in all its phases of deindustrialization, shifts of population, etc., the problem of preventing starvation, disease and unrest in Germany would be considerably more acute than under the more moderate Potsdam program.† In either case, the kind of German government possible under the occupation, wholly subordinate to the Allied Commission, with the nazi, landowning, military and industrial leadership eliminated, could not possibly solve it unaided. Mr. Morgenthau argues against any help to the Germans in the way of medical supplies or food on the additional ground that such supplies would have to be diverted from the liberated countries. Our own abundance answers this conclusively.

The book contains a copy of Mr. Morgenthau's original "Program to Prevent Germany from Starting a World War III," which with its author accompanied the President to the Quebec Conference in September, 1944—a moment during the war when Treasury influence on our foreign policy was at its height. The book also contains a copy of the Potsdam Declaration, and with the publication on October 18 of the State-War-Navy-Treasury April 19, 1945 directive to General Eisenhower on the military government of the American zone it becomes possible to trace the evolution of our peace policy toward Germany through the three principal documents.

Good sense prevailed at Potsdam, and is prevailing in the administration of the American Zone under General Eisenhower. (See his report to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on October 16.) Deindustrialization is strictly limited, and the Allies are underwriting average living conditions not exceeding (and presumably somewhat lower than) the average standards of European countries. Reparations withdrawals must not jeopardize these living standards! See the clause in the Declaration which reads: "The determination of the amount and character of the industrial capital equipment unnecessary for the German peace economy, and therefore available for reparations shall be made by the Control Council," etc. Wage, price and rationing policies uniform throughout Germany are being established. These controls are to be administered by Germans to the fullest extent practicable, but the ultimate responsibility of the Control Commission for the minimum living standards is clearly defined. Any other policy would be simply vindictive, and would certainly demoralize the American occupation, as Mr. Morgenthau implicitly recognized in his plea that American forces be withdrawn as quickly as possible and civil and police administration (except for membership in the top commissions) be entrusted to Europeans.

---

†General Eisenhower's report of October 16 to the Joint Chiefs of Staff noted that in August it was highly doubtful that the gross national product of Germany was as much as 25 percent of the wartime level.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Morgenthau plan had considerable value in speeding the formulation of a peace policy for Germany in the months immediately preceding victory. Its author's public influence died with his great friend, Franklin Roosevelt, who often accomplished much by setting one group of his subordinates against another. One does not have to fear that "Germany Is Our Problem," a not very effective propaganda piece, will whip up public opinion or otherwise succeed in altering the Allied peace policy in Germany.

Arms and the Man

RICHARD J. PURCELL

MAJOR GENERAL FULLER, British Army, Ret., a soldier of the Boer War, the protagonist of the motor-machine-gun in World War I, and designer of the classic tank corps attack at Cambrai, has added to his body of writings this informative, provocative, dogmatic, frankly assertive, and courageous little volume interpreting history in terms of arms and armament. Retired six years, he was not recalled though only about 62 years of age in 1939. A conservative, a gentleman, and a writer, he was allowed to write history. This he does with audacious subjectivity, on the basis of wide reading including American writers on modern warfare and culture such as Edward Mead Earle, Lewis Mumford, and Quincy Wright.

There is no glorification of war and no stressing morality in war. Totila, the Ostrogoth, heeding Belisarius's plea, left Rome undamaged. Theodoric cautioned Clovis to treat the defeated Alemanni with moderation. Tilly's massacre at Magdeburg horrified Christendom. This being true, General Fuller continues with a contrast:

> How many of the leaders of the nations in the present war have sought to save Berlin? Not one! . . . in 1943, the massacre of Hamburg was received with acclamations in England as had the massacre of Coventry in 1940 in Germany. . . . when it was suggested to Gustavus Adolphus that he should demolish the Ducal palace in Munich, not only did he reject the advice with indignation, but he took particular care to preserve it. Today that palace is a rubble heap.

General Fuller does not go as far as our picturesque fighting General Patton who is quoted as saying war is inevitable; but he does not believe "that war can be eliminated, because it is part and parcel of life." He holds, however, that war can be restricted as it was under Pax Romana, the medieval or Christian way, and Pax Britannica. Today, he finds that "war has very nearly become a thing in itself—that is, an activity divorced from the very idea of peace, with destruction as its sole aim."

"Whereas religious, political, economic and moral systems not only change, but at times vanish in their entirety, though military systems also change, war is never annihi-

*Armament and History. Major General J. F. C. Fuller. Scribners. $2.50.

B. ALTMAN & CO.
SHOPS FOR MEN

pair 1.50

MEN'S WOOL SOCKS

6/3 rib

on those cold days when you feel as if you're walking on ice, slip into these warm wool socks. They're comfortable and well-made for long wear. In black, navy, brown or maroon. Sizes 10 1/2 to 13.

Altman men's furnishings, main floor

mail and phone (MU. 9-7000) orders filled

B. Altman & Co. Fifth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.
Also at our East Orange and White Plains Shop.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lated"—for the evolution of offensive and defensive weapons has continued from the stone hammer to the atomic bomb. And this same inventiveness has stimulated culture and industry as well as war! The weapon or the machine wins wars, more than strategy, command, and morale. France and England failed to realize in a machine age that it is "machine-power and not manpower which wins in war," and refused for twenty years to mould their armies around machines, armored and mobile. Quite aside from this, Fuller insists that "contraception sapped the fighting vigor of France between 1870 and 1940" even as abortion tended to destroy the vigor of Rome under the Caesars.

Following a chapter on ancient tactics and personal valor, General Fuller considers the age of the Church, chivalry, and feudalism. The Church accepted war "as part of man's original sin"; transformed the classical soldier "into the idealized Christian Knight of Chivalry"; mitigated the evils of warfare with the Peace of God, the Truce of God, and such sanctions as excommunication and the interdict which "branded the aggressor as the culprit"; anathematized the arbalest and missile fighting—unless possibly against pagans, for everything was used by the crusaders. Plausible is the proposed thesis introducing a chapter on gunpowder:

> Thus, by changing the character of war, gunpowder changed the Medieval (Christian) way of life. The search after perfecting of weapons and of defenses against them gave birth to a spirit of enquiry which soon embraced all things in general. It was gunpowder, more than contact with Islam during the Crusades (1095-1444) or the fall of Constantinople in 1453, which gave life to the Renaissance, because it shattered the medieval order both physically and morally.

Not only the Eastern Empire but castles in France crashed under cannon shot. Gentlemen gave way to mercenaries and conscripts, even as Cervantes wrote that "the devilish invention of artillery" enabled a "base cowardly hand to take the life of the bravest gentleman." For naval armament, Henry VIII could pay the cost "for the plunder of the Church enabled him to spend on a scale" impossible for his predecessors. Howard of Effingham overpowered the Armada with "great ordnance" whereas he might have lost the fight by boarding Spanish men-of-war as his critics urged. Small arms, bayonets, and howitzers followed, and they hastened industrialization especially in the age of steam.

Mass fighting came when Napoleon harnessed the nation to his conquests. With truth, this war criminal could boast: "I can afford to expend thirty thousand men a month." Artillery, Gatling guns, rifles, military railroads, iron clad ships, colony grabbing, capitalism, the theory of war as an enrichment of nations and munition makers, inventions and counter inventions have made war more hideous and presumably more inevitable. The age of oil was characterized by tanks, aircraft, submarines, mustard gas, the total mobilization of industry, and the conscription of whole peoples for war and war production. Morality and decency were cast to the winds in World War I which destroyed three empires, economically ruined the defeated nations, and bled white the victors other than the United States.

Fuller's views of World War II are set forth with dismal candor. Technology, unemployment, and self-sufficient blocs of nations linked "by a currency based on the capacity to produce" as opposed to nations which sought to retain a gold standard, resulted in conflicting ideologies, assembly lines in thought and production, and war. Radar, fire control, flying bombs, rockets, rocket-planes, plastics, tactics integrating air-sea-land commands, and supplies and reenforcement rained down from the air are noted in their significance as war became a struggle between industrialists, inventors, and scientists of different countries. Herewith he notes: "Never before in all history, has man so fervently bent his will to destruction." The spiritual return to the Dark Age, he finds in the new feudalism, established "by reducing the masses to a servile proletariat, and . . . by exalting over them the State as the supreme overlord with a vast bureaucracy as its baronage." Presumably the bureaucrats are unpedigreed.

Gloomy are the General's fears of inevitable absorption of small nations like Belgium, Holland, and Denmark by greater powers as already has proven the case in Eastern Europe:

> Poland, the Baltic States, and the Balkan countries are each too lacking in material resources to wage mechanized war; therefore they are being swallowed up by the USSR, not only to add to the strength of the Soviets, but to deprive Europe as a whole of strength to wage war against the Soviets.

The precedent for declaring future wars, he sees in Pearl Harbor. Non-totalitarian nations fight totalitarian nations with totalitarian methods: the propaganda of hate; "the lie shall make you fight"; and sadistic joy in extermination, as though the Germans were "the sole people who had ever caused a war or the sole aggressive nation remaining in the world." In Stalin, General Fuller puts no trust as he suggests that "oil will decide whether Pax Sovietica or Pax Americana is for another brief space of time to give peace to the world." As he laid down his pen, there came Hiroshima.

More Books of the Week

Benjamin Franklin's Autobiographical Writings. Selected and edited by Carl Van Doren. Viking. $5.00.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN is an amazing person, but what is truly extraordinary about his long life is that there is still so large a number of his writings of all sorts that are little known or never have been published, in spite of his being "the sage" among the "Founders," a household word and name known to everybody, and a required part of every schoolchild's education. Carl Van Doren includes here fifty more letters or other papers which are not to be found in the latest collected edition and which have been assembled from scattered sources. He includes another fifty which have never before been printed in full, and "fewer than ten of them ever printed in part," almost every one of which "adds something to what the most careful student of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Franklin editions and biographies might be expected to know." He is an inexhaustible mine for anyone who wants to know what America is, and who Americans once thought they were, from the lips of that great one who was so fully part of our founding and tradition, who belongs so definitely both to England and America—to the new-fledged British Empire and the newly-hatched federal union of American republics—and beyond them, to the world.

Neither the British Empire nor our union of States is old. Both are new, dynamic, and in process of evolution. Both come from the same essential sources. Each has exchanged with the other convictions to which each has clung most obstinately and to the point of war; and in all their embryonic stirrings, Franklin was deeply concerned. In all, he had a formative, and largely a conclusive part. Our school children learn of him as a great revolutionist. He was also, and without any doubt, the greatest of British empire builders. He was, regretfully, a secessionist from the new empire he helped to build because his German king saw the thing too narrowly at the moment Franklin's mind had begun to bud with the idea of a British Commonwealth of Nations.

Joseph Lalley of the Washington *Post,* who has just reviewed this book, uses a happy phrase in that connection: ". . . he was the perfect avatar of his age. He embodied all the virtues on which the age set value and which its best men strove to cultivate. . . ." Perhaps that is why there is always something new to discover about him, for, as Lalley puts it ". . . if the God of the eighteenth century deists can be conceived anthropomorphically, he would be fashioned, I should think, pretty much in Dr. Franklin's image; that is, a creator who arranged and managed His universe in the same benign, thrifty, and practical spirit in which Franklin . . . managed . . . invented. . . ." Sound common sense, shrewdness, belief in the inherent goodness of mankind matched his wide vision and practical inventiveness. And Benjamin was a play-actor. His letters are full of descriptions of his preparations for some great victory of state-craft, some drollery in which he takes the keenest delight. Most of the writers about Franklin concentrate on some one or other of the myriad facets of his reflection. None has yet made the picture complete and final, for he is not unique; he is a synthesis of American history.

WILLIAM FRANKLIN SANDS.

Kitchen Fugue. Sheila Kaye-Smith. Harper. $2.75.

THESE are cockle-warming, civilized belles-lettres, completely unpretentious: the jottings in her commonplace book of a delightfully complete human being at a most uncommon (we hope) moment in human history. As "incidents" spoil her crops and despoil her chicken-run, and generally disrupt the diurnal rhythm of her Sussex farm life, Sheila Kaye-Smith, author of some twenty-five novels and nearly a dozen other works, scribbles—to exorcise her horror of noise, and her real fear of what is making the noise and to voice her own dignified, essentially feminine protest against the present discontents.

The recipes she offers—oral or material—are a triumph of mind over matter. Medicinal paraffin as a salad dressing in the place of the absolutely non-existent olive-oil (even on a doctor's prescription not a teaspoonful can be procured) is a touch of genius—especially in England, the land that invented early morning tea as the nation's way of dealing with a national curse. . . . Sheila Kaye-Smith's

This Publishing Business

THE CATHOLICS' PROFILE

Take

the best

New Yorker

PROFILE

you ever read

Imagine

such a profile
not of a man but of the

CATHOLIC CHURCH UPON EARTH

Imagine

it drawn
not by one artist but by

TWENTY-FOUR

Imagine

that among the
twenty-four were such as

TOLSTOY
CHESTERTON
STEPHEN VINCENT BENÉT
O. HENRY
and HARRY SYLVESTER

Imagine

all that and
you still have not
imagined

OUR FATHER'S HOUSE

A collection of short stories about Catholics compiled by SISTER MARIELLA GABLE, O.S.B. ($3.00)

At your booksellers or

Sheed & Ward, 63-5 Av. N. Y. C. 3

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kitchen Fugue

by SHEILA KAYE-SMITH

"An author's scrapbook of ideas, a hodge-podge of odd and interesting information . . . family stories, childhood reminiscences, advice, scraps of autobiography, recipes, notes of animal husbandry, even thoughts on the changing religious and economic structure of our new world . . . Like an English version of E. B. White's pieces about life in Maine, a Sussex *One Man's Meat.*"

—Book-of-the-Month Club News.

$2.75

At all bookstores

HARPER

LAVAL THEOLOGIQUE ET PHILOSOPHIQUE

Vol. I No. 1—August, 1945

Theological and Philosophical Review

published twice a year by

Laval University, Quebec, Canada

ARTICLES IN FRENCH AND ENGLISH

Each issue, 200 pages: $2.00

Subscription price: $3.00 a year

Apply for free specimen copy

Editions de l'Université Laval, Québec, Canada

For New Subscribers

THE COMMONWEAL
386 Fourth Avenue
New York 16, N. Y.

For the enclosed $1 send the next 15 issues of THE COMMONWEAL to

.....

.....

.....

119

insistence too, on those un-English essentials, soup and salad, is full of hope for the future; her *potage bonne femme* is fool-proof (I have just made it most successfully) and what she can do with vegetables would make the Frenchman who said England had seventy-two religions and only one sauce, eat his words and choke on them too. Seriously, her menus are not only really simple, specifying even to the size of the saucepan and spoon required, but they are also a shame-making reminder of what, in these days, cooking in Europe is: the disguising by what Sheila Kaye-Smith calls "shifts, shams and swindles," of edible (?) material that is to food or nourishment what the Emperor's new clothes were to dress.

If you can invent two succulent ways of dealing with the oldest inhabitants of the farmyard, when you have to scurry under the kitchen table several times in the process whilst "doodlebugs" pass (you pray) over your house; if you can think of twenty-five ways of cooking rabbit, and coax cocoa into a semblance of chocolate ice cream to delight your gourmet friends passing a blacked-out evening happily with you—then—then you'll be a cook, my friend. And Sheila Kaye-Smith is that and more. She is a real and serious (not gentleman-type) farmer, and she is a true Catholic. She and her Anglican husband both came into the Church at no small earthly cost, and how she has grown; from her rather ye-olde-pottery early earthy novels "racy of the soil," etc., to her present accomplished understated, humorous grown-up idiom. Her discussion of the relation of human beings to animals is excellent as are all her incursions into theology, especially her chapter on Martha and Mary. It is devoutly to be hoped she will give us more "Kitchen Fugues," and more recipes not only for cooking but for contemplating (in its technical sense) meanwhile—*she* evidently can—and more, indeed, of everything that she has put into this sensible small book.

ANNE FREMANTLE.

Cass Timberlane. Sinclair Lewis. Random. $2.75.

SINCLAIR LEWIS has lost little of his old perception of our American scene. His eye still takes in the astonishing vagaries of our folk-ways, and he can still summon up some of the most cantankerous, fatuous, and maddening characters in contemporary fiction. Why Judge Timberlane never thought to carry home his gavel and wallop Jinny, his bird-like and bird-brained spouse upon her pretty little head remains, after 390 pages, a matter of increasing wonder.

The novel deals with the harassing problems of marriage in our day. We watch, in the main tent of the dusty circus, the inane waywardness of Jinny. Her antics, her irresponsible misconduct, and her almost complete lack of appreciation are set off sharply by the steady restraint and Job-like patience of His Honor, her husband. After a long series of minor infractions of the marriage code, Jinny goes whole hog and runs off to join Bradd Criley, her husband's "best friend," in a debauch of sex and diabetes in New York.

Worked into the major design—the marital misadventures of Cass and Jinny—are other episodes having thematic relations, the marital misadventures of other inhabitants of their city, Grand Republic, Minnesota.

Lewis's novel shows him still the master of mimicry marking his finer work of the twenties and thirties. His wit and satire are as pungent as ever; yet underneath the raillery one hears something of the sad strain which sounded in "Arrowsmith" (his longest shot to date). "Cass

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Timberlane" does not come up to the level of that book, but it is far better than "Gideon Planish," his last, and proves that Sinclair Lewis continues in possession of a formidable supply of ammunition against his old enemies, pride, pretention, and stupidity. He has made up with the mid-land burghers, all right, and wishes to be among them, but his reconciliation has not been bought at the price of capitulation. CHARLES DUFFY.

Conrad Weiser. Paul A. Wallace. Pennsylvania. $5.00.

IT IS strange that Conrad Weiser, that noble and interesting German-American, should have to wait till this year in order to be the subject of a full-length biography while two or more biographies have been written on many lesser personalities. Strange, too, that none of the many German-American authors who were eager to stress the share German emigrants have played in the shaping of the democratic structure of our United States, did not precede Mr. Wallace in telling the life-story of the Wuerttemberg-born pioneer. It is hard to explain why Conrad Weiser has been so neglected. Few careers have such a rich and colorful background; few personalities of the early eighteenth century can be compared with this unique individual, mystic and realist, a traveler, linguist, expert in Indian folklore, woodsman, diplomat, writer and religious problem-child.

After his wife died while pregnant with her fifteenth child, Conrad's father emigrated to our shores with seven of his children amidst a shipload of more than four hundred "poor Palatines." When young Conrad breathed for the first time the free air of the New World, in mid-June of 1710, he was thirteen years old. Three years later we find him among black-haired men, who wore mantles of blanket-cloth, greased their bodies with bear's fat, glided silently through the woods in moccasins, living in a transitional culture between primitive and civilized levels. His father had allowed his son to live among the Mohawks and to learn their language in the hope that the gifted boy might in time make a good living as an interpreter. But sensitive Conrad surpassed all expectations and became so delighted with the backwoods and the Indian life that his contemporaries agree that he gained a more thorough understanding of the Indian mind and the native way of life than any other white man of his day.

This experience enabled him to play a leading rôle in shaping a more understanding and human Indian policy on the part of the white settlers. Thomas Penn (William Penn's son) praised him as "a very honest and useful man" and the six Indian nations with whom he served as an interpreter did the same. He felt himself bound by a double loyalty: to his Indian friends and to Pennsylvania. His success as a diplomat was that he held to a course within the bounds of common interest between Whites and Redskins and kept the unbroken respect of both parties. Weiser's ardent appreciation and defense of the Indian character is the first great American fight against racial discrimination. This attitude is due not only to his intimate knowledge of Indian life but to his own strongly developed spiritual qualities.

For long years Weiser, a born Lutheran, fought for deeper religious insight; for some time he was a member of the Seventh-day German Baptists, studied the pantheist philosophy of Jakob Boehme, and debated the great Pietist Zinzendorf on many religious problems. But he cleared his mind of many sectarian thoughts and of pantheist

Now, After Centuries, U. S. A. Labor and Industry Benefit by the Manufacture of U. S. A. Liturgical Editions

MISSAE DEFUNCTORUM

Editio Juxta Typicam Vaticanam

Mechanically, from strong india tint paper, to clear legibility of type, not to mention the copper plate crucifixion picture preceding the Canon Missae, the entire work is recognized as most inspiring. There are two sizes, the one for Regular Altar use and the other for Small Altar use.

Missae Defunctorum	SMALL ALTAR 8 x 11"	REGULAR ALTAR 9½ x 13"
Imitation Leather Cover..	$4.50	$6.50
Half Leather Cover.....	6.50	8.50
Full Morocco	12.00	15.00

— • • • —

U. S. A. Liturgical Editions

An American Breviary

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM
Editio Typica Vaticana
In two sizes. 4 vol. per set
Pocket Size—4 x 6—Morocco.....$35.00
Large Type—4½ x 7—Morocco..... 40.00

An American Missal

MISSALE ROMANUM
A size for every Altar.
Large Quarto—9 x 12—Red morocco.....$40.00
Quarto Size—8 x 11—Black sheepskin..... 30.00
Octavo Size—7 x 10—Red sheepskin..... 20.00
Hand Missal—4⅝ x 7—Morocco..... 7.50

RITUALE ROMANUM—12 mo.—4½"x7"
New complete edition with U.S.A. Supplement having Baptism and Marriage forms in English. Comprises so many important decrees lately issued by the Holy See.
Imitation leather—$3.50. Leather—$4.75. Morocco—$6.75

RITUALS
Baptismal Ritual—Black imitation leather..... $3.00
Marriage Ritual—Red imitation leather..... 4.00
Burial Ritual—Black imitation leather..... 4.00
Altar Prayers—Black imitation leather..... 3.50

THE PSALMS—Latin Edition $2.50
Authorized American edition of the New Latin Version—Cloth—350 pages.

The RACCOLTA
The new English Translation by Rev. Joseph P. Christopher, Ph.D., and Rev. Charles E. Spence, M.A. The Holy See's Official Book of Indulgenced Prayers for every purpose.
Boxed. Per Copy $3.85

Books for Priests

THE PRIEST AND ST. PAUL
By Rev. Otto Cohaux, S.J. A fund of practical knowledge $2.75

MEDITATIONS FOR THE SECULAR CLERGY
By Father Chaignon, S.J. 2 vols., 8 vo.....$10.00

A HOLY HOUR FOR PRIESTS
By the Most Rev. Francis Clement Kelley, D.D., with Music for the Hymns inserted..... $2.50

PRIESTS COMPANION
Rev. B. F. Marcetteau, S.S. $3.75

JESUS LIVING IN THE PRIEST
Rev. P. Millet, S.J..... $3.50

ADORO TE
By Dom Eugene Vandeur. Translated by Clara Morris Rumball. Suitable either for spiritual reading or for thanksgiving after Mass..... $2.00

BENZIGER BROTHERS, INC.
26-28 Park Place New York 7, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CATHOLIC LOOKS *at the* WORLD

by Francis E. McMahon

Associate Professor, University of Chicago
Formerly on the faculty of the University of Notre Dame

In this vigorous and courageous book, a prominent Catholic layman presents a consistently progressive point of view on such subjects as the failures of Christians and liberals, Christianity and democracy, and America in the emerging world.

"A remarkable book, shaped in the faith that democracy grew out of Christian doctrine."
—*Book-of-the-Month Club News.*

At all bookstores $2.75

THE VANGUARD PRESS
424 Madison Avenue New York 17

ANNHURST COLLEGE
R. F. D. 2, Putnam, Connecticut
Accredited College. Conducted by the Sisters of the Holy Ghost
Liberal Arts, Music, Natural and Social Sciences, Pre-Medical, Teacher Training, Preparation for Social Service, Secretarial. Address: THE DEAN.

SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE
NOTRE DAME
HOLY CROSS, INDIANA
SCHOOL OF SACRED THEOLOGY
for Sisters and Lay-women
Prerequisites: A degree of Bachelor of Arts
A reading knowledge of Latin

SCHOOL OF THE HOLY CHILD
SUFFERN, NEW YORK
Accredited. College preparatory and general course. Art, Music, Dancing, Dramatics. Outdoor sports. Resident and Day School. Separate Junior Department. In beautiful Ramapo Valley. 40 minutes from New York City. *Catalogue. Address The Prefect.* Phone: Suffern 765.

Removal Sale!
We are moving our business on December 1 to Emmitsburg, Maryland. Until that date all of our used, out-of-print Catholic books are offered at drastic reductions.
AQUIN BOOK SHOP
878 Lexington Ave. RE. 7-1256 N. Y. 21, N Y.

vagueness and he gave up his ineffectual rebellion against this imperfect world of ours, content to serve God by constructive works. He had no idea of the Catholic view; he indeed had no contacts with Catholicism, at that time almost unknown in Pennsylvania. But he made his peace with the Lutheran Church, worked for the modernization of Lutheran education and wrote some remarkable German hymns. Not only his sympathy with his Indian friends, but his deep Christian emotion forbade him to tolerate the conviction of most of the settlers that the best Indian is a dead Indian. This was to him an anti-Christian blasphemy, irreconcilable with his faith in God and his liking for his fellow-men and America.

Based on the most solid and painstaking research and on a wide knowledge of the colorful background of our Colonial history, Wallace has written an admirable biography of an outstanding figure. His book will satisfy both the learned historian and the amateur. The chapters on Indian history are best; those on Weiser's religious development not fully adequate. MAX FISCHER.

The Human Life of Jesus. John Erskine. Morrow. $3.00.

THERE is about Dr. Erskine's study an air at once reverent and sympathetic. He has put together a biography which lays stress upon the human in our Lord, which views Him as having taken on our limitations that He might show us how to live. Much of what is said is set down in the simple splendor of the Gospel text to which is coupled that kind of wise comment which springs from meditation. Often enough—in the pages on the Virgin Mother and in the treatment of the Parables for instance—one finds it hard to conceive of more heartfelt presentation.

And yet basic faults appear. With all the book's mention of the central doctrine of the Incarnation, there is throughout failure to see the implications of that teaching. For if our Lord is God as well as man, then His human nature is more perfectly endowed than is our own. Within the mind and soul of Christ there is place neither for the doubt and hesitancy whereof Dr. Erskine writes, nor for the struggle whereby He is thought to have acquired mastery of self. Similar criticism might be levelled against much else. One senses the inadequacy of the views expressed upon the mission and the miracles and the Resurrection of our Lord and one is aware that they are inconsonant with the teachings of the ancient Church. With so many points well taken, it is regrettable that others can scarcely be sustained.

HENRY G. J. BECK.

CONTRIBUTORS

B. HOLLANTS is the editor and owner of a number of periodicals in Belgium, among them *De Nieuwe Standaard.* She has recently been on a visit to the United States.
Sidney ABERMAN is an economist living in Norwich, Conn. He wrote his article with the aid of a Labor Department consultant.
Jessica POWERS is a religious in a contemplative order.
George DOHERTY, has served the United States Government in various capacities.
Richard J. PURCELL is Professor of American History at the Catholic University on leave of absence with War Production Board.
William Franklin SANDS is the author of numerous books and at present lives in Washington where he is frequently consulted by various governmental personalities.
Anne FREMANTLE is living in New York, N. Y.
Charles DUFFY teaches at the University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.
Max FISCHER is a German American journalist resident in New York, N. Y.
Rev. Henry G. J. BECK teaches at Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, N. J.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED